

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/538,949	08/18/2005	Walter Meier	FRG-16146	5607
	7590 08/16/2007 I PORTER & CLARK I	EXAMINER		
RANKIN, HILL, PORTER & CLARK LLP 38210 Glenn Avenue			THOMPSON, TIMOTHY J	
WILLOUGHBY, OH 44094-7808			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2873	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/538,949	MEIER, WALTER				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Timothy J. Thompson	2873				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL	V IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MO	NTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS				
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period really reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 36(a). In no event, however, may a rep will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH c, cause the application to become ABAI	ATION. By be timely filed S from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·					
· —	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	=x рапе Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
•	☑ Claim(s) <u>21-27 and 29-49</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	wn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) <u>33-42, 47-49</u> is/are allowed.	A					
 6) Claim(s) 21-27,30-32 and 43-46 is/are rejected 7) Claim(s) 29 is/are objected to. 	u.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.					
•						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on 6/14/2007 is/are: a) □		o by the Examiner				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	19(a)-(d) or (f).				
· — ·						
2. Certified copies of the priority document						
Copies of the certified copies of the prior		eceived in this National Stage				
application from the International Burea		timed				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	or the certified copies not re	eceivea.				
Attachment(s)		(PTO 412)				
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/	mmary (PTO-413) Mail Date				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Info	ormal Patent Application .·				

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 29 is objected to because of the following informalities: It depends form a canceled claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 21-27, 30-32, 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(B) as being anticipated by Goff(U.S. Pat. No. 6,417,894).

Regarding claim 21, Goff discloses a large-area visual medium to be arranged in front of the display screen (fig 1, 14), wherein the device comprises a holding means (fig 1, 15) for arranging the visual medium in front of the display screen, and in that visual medium has a focal width between 1122 mm and 1405 mm(if a 17 inch display with a magnification of 1.4 is chooses, the focal width is equal to 1168 mm;(col 8, line 59 to col 9, line 25, theses values are within the variable ranges given for the patent); the device has a diameter of more than 370 nm(col 9, lines 10-35).

Application/Control Number: 10/538,949

Art Unit: 2873

Regarding claim 22, Goff discloses, wherein the device is optimized for observing a complete display screen(col 4, lines 49-55) with both eyes(col 9, lines 34-40).

Regarding claim 23, Goff discloses an eye distance of 220 mm to 1500 mm(col 9, lines 7-10).

Regarding claim 24, Goff discloses the object distance is between 100mm and 1500 mm(col 9, lines 10-15)

Regarding claim 25, Goff discloses the focal width is between 1149mmm and 1347mm(if a 17 inch display with a magnification of 1.35 is chooses; col 8, line 59 to col 9, line 25, theses values are within the variable ranges given for the patent)

Regarding claim 26, Goff discloses the focal width is between 1194mmm and 1235mm(if a 17 inch display with a magnification of 1.37 is choosen; col 8, line 59 to col 9, line 25, theses values are within the variable ranges given for the patent)

Regarding claim 27, Goff discloses the focal width is equal to 1200 mm(if a 17 inch display with a magnification between 1.35 and 1.37 is choosen; col 8, line 59 to col 9, line 25, theses values are within the variable ranges given for the patent).

Regarding claim 30, Goff discloses a system of several lenses(fig 3).

Regarding claim 31, Goff discloses a single, spherical lens(col 8, lines 60-65).

Regarding claim 32, Goff discloses a plano convex, concave-convex or biconvex(col 8, lines 60-65).

Regarding claim 46, Goff discloses a large-area visual medium to be arranged in front of the display screen (fig 1, 14), wherein the device comprises a holding means (fig 1, 15) for arranging the visual medium in front of the display screen, and in that visual

Art Unit: 2873

medium has a focal width between 1122 mm and 1405 mm (if a 17 inch display with a magnification of 1.4 is chooses, the focal width is equal to 1168 mm; (col 8, line 59 to col 9, line 25, theses values are within the variable ranges given for the patent); the device has a diameter of more than 370 nm(col 9,lines 10-35); the holding means is a table stand with means for adjusting the height and or inclination of the visible medium(fig 1)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 43, 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goff(U.S. Pat. No. 6,417,894) as applied to claim 31 above, and further in view of Ebina et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,088,508).

Regarding claim 43 and 44, Goff as detailed in claim rejection 31 above does not disclose an anti reflective coating. However, Ebina et al. discloses an anti reflective coating on a magnifying lens(col 3, lines 35-40). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use an anti reflective coating as shown by Ebina et al., with the magnifying device of Goff, since as shown by Ebina et al. anti reflective coating are commonly used with magnifying system so as to reduce the glare a viewer sees on the screen. Regarding the method of attaching the anti reflective

Application/Control Number: 10/538,949

Art Unit: 2873

coating to the lens is not given patentatble weight being this is a germane to the issue of patentability of the device itself.

Page 5

Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goff(U.S. Pat. No. 6,417,894) as applied to claim 31 above, and further in view of Mcgowan et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,086,228).

Regarding claim 45, Goff discloses the holding means is an adjustable arm with several degrees of freedom(fig 1). Goff does not disclose holding means can be fastened on a table. However, Mcgowan et al. discloses holding means can be fastened on a table(fig 1, 22-26). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use an holding means can be fastened on a table as shown by Mcgowan et al., with the magnifying device of Goff, since as shown by Mcgowan et al. holding means which can be fastened on a table is commonly used to securely affix the magnifying device in the desired position and being that todays monitiors are becoming lighter they may not provide the required force to securely position the magnifying device.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 33-42, 47-49 are allowed.

Art Unit: 2873

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: The prior art taken either singularity or in combination fails to anticipate or fairly suggest the limitations of the independent claim, in such a manner that a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 or 103 would be proper. The prior art fails to teach a combination of all the claimed features as presented in independent claim 33, 35, 37, 39, 41, 47, 48, with the allowable features being the specific radius of curvature plano-convex on the convex side(claim 33); the first and second radius of curvature of the biconvex lens(claim 35, 37, 39); a single spherical lens that is plano convex with a specific radius of curvature(claim 41); the distance of the device to the display screen and the viewers eyes to the device(claim 47, 48). Therefore claims 33-42, 47-49 are allowed.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Timothy J. Thompson whose telephone number is (571) 272-2342. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 6:00 Pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mack Ricky can be reached on (571) 272-2333. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2873

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TJT

Jan Man